



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

federal service for militia had been impliedly repealed by the Hay Bill. He was seized by United States officers, and, thereupon, succeeded in having a writ of *habeas corpus* issued. *Held*, that he be returned to custody. *Sweester v. Emerson*, U. S. Circ. Ct. of Appeals (1st Circ.) (not yet reported).

For a discussion of the principles involved in this case, see NOTES, p. 176.

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACT TO DEVISE — STATUTE OF FRAUDS — BREACH BY PROMISEE — INJUNCTION AGAINST PROBATE OF INCONSISTENT WILL. — In compliance with the terms of an oral agreement entered into between a son and father, by which the father promised to devise his homestead to the son in return for the son's engagement to live with and support the father and mother during their lives, the son entered and made improvements on the land, and the father executed and delivered to the son a will in his favor. After fifteen years of performance, the son died. Both his wife and executor offered to complete the contract, but the father refused and went to live with the defendants, to whom he subsequently devised the homestead. The plaintiffs, the heirs-at-law of the son, bring this action to enjoin the probate of the second will, and to declare a trust in their favor of the homestead in fee, subject only to the surviving widow's life estate. *Held*, that the injunction issue and the trust be declared. *Torgerson v. Hauge*, 159 N. W. 6 (N. D.).

It is well established that valid contracts to devise realty in consideration of personal services will be specifically enforced against the heir or devisee where the promisee has fully performed. *Parsell v. Stryker*, 41 N. Y. 480; *Howe v. Watson*, 179 Mass. 30, 60 N. E. 415. See *Johnson v. Hubbell*, 10 N. J. Eq. 332, 335. And it has been held, as in the principal case, that the execution and delivery of a will in pursuance of the parol contract satisfies the Statute of Frauds. *Naylor v. Shelton*, 102 Ark. 30, 143 S. W. 117; *Brinkner v. Brinkner*, 7 Pa. 53, 55. Whatever the merits of this notion, the contract in the principal case may on one theory be "taken out of the Statute" upon the basis of making lasting improvements where taking of possession was impossible, the part performance being of such a nature that the court cannot restore the promisee to his former position or adequately compensate him in damages. *Sutton v. Hayden*, 62 Mo. 101; *Best v. Grolapp*, 69 Neb. 811, 96 N. W. 641. But cf. *Barnes v. Teague*, 1 Jones Eq. (N. C.) 277, 279; *Burns v. Daggett*, 141 Mass. 368, 6 N. E. 727; *Butcher v. Stapely*, 1 Vernon 363; *Frame v. Dawson*, 14 Vesey 386. But the plaintiff, the promisee, is not entitled to specific enforcement unless his promise has been fully performed, for the court is powerless, and at all stages of the agreement has been powerless, to insure enjoyment in specie to the promisor. *Jones v. How*, 9 C. B. 1; *Newman v. French*, 138 Iowa 482, 116 N. W. 468; *Bourget v. Monroe*, 58 Mich. 563, 25 N. W. 514. Cf., however, *Bartley v. Greenleaf*, 112 Iowa 82, 83 N. W. 824; *Prater v. Prater*, 94 S. C. 267, 77 S. E. 936. Nor is this altered by the offers to perform by the widow and the executor; the personal nature of the obligation allows the substitution to be refused without prejudice to the promisor. *Blakely v. Sousa*, 197 Pa. 305, 47 Atl. 286; *Schultz v. Johnson's Adm'r*, 5 B. Mon. (Ky.) 497. See WALD'S POLLOCK ON CONTRACTS, 3 ed., 543, note. The denial of specific performance, however, does not leave the children of the son without remedy. The value of their father's services may be recovered in *quantum meruit*. *Wolfe v. Howes*, 20 N. Y. 197; *Green v. Gilbert*, 21 Wis. 395. See KEENER, QUASI-CONTRACTS, 244. The value of the improvements may likewise be recovered. *Smith v. Adm'rs of Smith*, 28 N. J. L. 208. Further, the principal case asserts the jurisdiction of equity to enjoin probate of a will made in violation of a contract to devise. Since probate merely establishes the fact of the will, theoretically the injunction should not issue. *Sumner v. Crane*, 155 Mass. 483, 29 N. E. 1151; *Allen v. Bromberg*, 147 Ala. 317, 41 So. 771. In the principal case, however, the practical advantage of completely disposing of the cause in one action justifies the intervention.